DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 838 UD 027 441

AUTHOR	Marks, Ellen L.
TITLE	A Review of Information on Institutionalized Youths and the ECIA Chapter I Neglected or Delinquent Program.
INSTITUTION	Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.; Research and Training Associates, Inc., Overland Park, KS.; Westat, Inc., Rockville, MD.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Apr 88
CONTRACT	300870124
NOTE	53p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; Child Neglect; *Correctional Education; Delinquency; Federal Programs; *Institutionalized Persons; Juvenile Justice; Literature Reviews; *Program Evaluation; *Rehabilitation Programs; *Supplementary Education; *Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews and summarizes available information on the neglected or delinquent youth population, on education programs for delinquent youth, and on the Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) program funded under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act that serves a portion of that population residing in state-operated or state-supported facilities. Relatively few neglected or abused children who have not been charged with any crime are assigned to state facilities; delinquent youth, who have been arrested and charged with a crime, are managed through another set of procedures in the juvenile justice system; and some youth under the age of 21, whose offenses or behavior warrant adult treatment, are adjudicated through the adult criminal justice system. Correctional facilities may offer multiple services to inmates, such as education, training, and employment. Academic instruction in juvenile facilities may constitute a major portion of the inmate's day and is often individualized; adult facilities offer a wider range of voluntary programs and instructional techniques vary depending on the inmates' skill levels. One of the chief purposes of education for institutionalized youth is to prepare them for re-entry into non-institutionalized settings, but little information is available on outcomes. To be eligible for Chapter 1 services, an institutionalized youth must lack a high school diploma and be enrolled for at least 10 hours per week in an organized program of instruction supported by non-federal funds. Program evaluation research is scant, the literature has little common focus, and findings are often not generalizable because of the limited scope of past studies. Statistical data are included on nine tables. A list of information sources and a list of 76 references are appended. (FMW)

ED319838

A REVIEW OF INFORMATION ON INSTITUTIONALIZED YOUTHS AND THE ECIA CHAPTER 1 NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

April 1988

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Westat, Inc.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WESTAT
An Employee-Owned Research Corporation

UD 027 441

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A REVIEW OF INFORMATION ON INSTITUTIONALIZED YOUTHS AND THE ECIA CHAPTER 1 NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT PROGRAM

April 1988

Contract No. 300870124

Submitted to:

U.S. Department of Education
Planning and Evaluation Service
Washington, D.C. 20202

Submitted by:

Westat, Inc.
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850
(301) 251-1500

In affiliation with:

Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
1718 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Research & Training Associates
10800 Farley
Overland Park, KS 62210

POLICY STUDIES ASSOCIATES, INC.
1718 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W. • SUITE 700 • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20009 • (202) 939-9780

A Review of Information on Institutionalized Youths and the ECIA Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Program

Ellen L. Marks

April 1988

Table of Contents

	Page
The Neglected or Delinquent Population	1
Neglected Youths	1
Delinquent Youths	2
Youths in the Adult Criminal Justice System	11
Education in the Correctional Facility	16
Academic Instruction	19
Vocational Instruction	22
Developments in Corrections Education	22
Transitional Programs and Post-Release Experiences	23
Chapter 1 for Neglected or Delinquent Youths in State Facilities	26
Statutory and Regulatory Provisions	29
Chapter 1 N or D Program Administration	30
Characteristics of Chapter 1 N or D Students and Programs	32
Programmatic Information Available in U.S. Department of Education Files	38
Conclusions	39

Tables

		Page
1.	Delinquent Juveniles Held in Public Juvenile Facilities, 1985 . .	5
2.	Number of State Juvenile Facilities and Residents by Type of Facility, 1983 and 1985	7
3.	Average Per-Day and Per-Placement Operating Costs in Public Juvenile Facilities, 1984	8
4.	Demographic Characteristics and Adjudication Status of Juveniles Held in Public Juvenile Facilities, 1985	10
5.	Charges Against Juveniles Heard in Adult Courts	13
6.	State Prison Admissions, Sentence Length, and Time Served by Type of Offense	15
7.	1987-88 Average Daily Attendance and Grant Amounts by State . . .	28
8.	Number of Facilities Participating in the Chapter 1 N or D Program by State, 1983-84	33
9.	Weekly Instructional Time	36

The U.S. Department of Education has contracted with Westat, Inc. for a three-year study to examine the ECIA Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent (N or D) program, which provides services to neglected or delinquent youths residing in state-operated or state-supported facilities. This paper reviews existing information that may guide subsequent research activities. It first presents an overview of the neglected or delinquent population. It then discusses education programs in correctional facilities. The paper concludes with a review of the Chapter 1 N or D program. A list of sources contacted or searched to locate information is contained in an appendix to this paper.

THE NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT POPULATION

Youths who are eligible for Chapter 1 neglected or delinquent services enter state-operated or state-supported facilities in a variety of ways. Neglected children are treated through one set of procedures in the juvenile system; delinquent youths are managed through another set of procedures in the juvenile justice system; and some youths under the age of 21 are adjudicated through the adult criminal justice system. An overview of the three groups of youths is presented below.[1]

Neglected Youths

Abused and neglected children can be referred to juvenile court. These instances, known as dependency and neglect cases, involve charges against parents or guardians of neglect, inadequate care, abandonment, desertion, abuse, cruel treatment, or improper or inadequate conditions in the home

---

[1]Neglected or delinquent children in local-level facilities (that is, those not administered by a state agency) are eligible for services under the Chapter 1 basic grants program, which provides extra funds to local school districts to meet the special educational needs of these youths.

(Nimick et al., 1985). Occasionally, a parent or guardian may turn over to the court a youth who has become, from the adult's viewpoint, troublesome or unmanageable. This "incorrigible" youth becomes classified as neglected, rather than delinquent, because he or she has not been charged with any statutory offense. In 1982, courts having juvenile jurisdiction disposed of an estimated 172,500 dependency and neglect cases. The rate of dependency and neglect cases, defined as the number of processed cases per 1,000 children ages 0 through 17, has remained relatively constant over the past 25 years; in 1982, the rate was 2.7 per thousand (Nimick et al., 1985).

A court or social service agency may return neglected children to their parent or guardian or assign them to settings outside their home. Most of those removed from their homes are sent to other relatives, community-based homes, or foster parents. Relatively few neglected children are assigned to state-operated or state-supported facilities, reflecting society's preference to care for these youths in more home-like environments. Precise counts of the numbers of neglected children in state facilities are not available, but existing data provide an estimate. On one selected day in 1985, 644 juveniles were held in public facilities, both state and local, throughout the country. They were held for reasons including dependency, neglect, abuse, emotional disturbance, or mental retardation. An additional 299 had been voluntarily admitted—rather than committed through a legal or social service agency process—to public juvenile facilities (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986a).

Delinquent Youths

Youths who are labelled "delinquent" have been arrested and charged with committing a crime. Juvenile delinquents manifest social and school

behaviors different from their nondelinquent peers. One study comparing the two groups of youths found that (Kane and Bragg, 1984):

- Delinquents were more than three times as likely as nondelinquents to have repeated a grade in school.
- Eighty percent of delinquents had been suspended from school because of their behavior, compared to 30 percent of nondelinquents.
- Delinquents were almost three times more likely to have missed 15 days of school per year.
- Delinquents would rather work than go to school.
- Delinquents were five times more likely than their nondelinquent peers to work full-time while attending school; delinquents were less likely than nondelinquents to work part-time while attending school.
- Delinquents were less likely to read well enough or use math well enough to earn passing grades.

The range of juvenile offenses is broad. One set of violations unique to the juvenile justice system is status offenses, which are crimes by virtue of the age of the perpetrator; in other words, they would not necessarily be crimes if committed by an adult. Status offenses include loitering, curfew violation, liquor law violation, and running away from a parent or guardian. The percent of juveniles committed to or detained at correctional facilities as a result of status offenses has declined in recent years—from 11.3 percent in 1977 to 4.7 percent in 1985—because of the decriminalization of status offenses and efforts to treat these youngsters in less restrictive environments (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1985; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986a).[2]

---

[2]In the 1970s, youth advocates and criminal justice experts led a movement to treat status offenders with punishments less severe than incarceration. This culminated in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, which emphasized the removal of juveniles from adult jails and the deinstitutionalization of status offenders.

On a given day in 1985, of 49,322 youths in public juvenile facilities, 2,293 were held because of status offenses. Interestingly, although females account for only 13 percent of all juvenile offenders, they represent 52 percent of all juveniles held for committing status offenses (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986a).

Delinquent acts committed by juveniles—that is, those that would be criminal if committed by adults—include violent crimes, such as murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault; property offenses, including burglary, arson, larceny, and motor vehicle theft; alcohol and drug offenses; public order offenses; and probation violations. On a given day in 1985, of the 46,000 youths assigned to public juvenile facilities for committing delinquent acts, nearly half were held for crimes of property (Table 1).

One notable feature of the juvenile justice system is the degree of flexibility afforded those charged with its operation. In many jurisdictions, a police officer may handle certain types of offenses in an informal manner (Tracy et al., 1985). Likewise, the prosecuting attorney or intake unit may choose to refer the case to a social service agency rather than the courts. In many instances, the juvenile court has the option to accept or reject the case, or it may refer the case to a criminal court.

In 1982 (the most recent year for which comprehensive data are available), the courts addressed an estimated 1,292,500 delinquency cases. The rate of delinquency cases, defined as the number of disposed cases per 1,000 children ages 10 through 17, has steadily increased from about 20 in 1960 and now stands at 43.2 (Nimick et al., 1985). When the court finds a juvenile guilty, a number of options are available. In addition to

incarceration, the juvenile court may choose from probation, restitution, fines, placement in foster homes or treatment facilities, or participation in special programs. These programs may include shoplifting prevention, counseling, or driver education (Snarr, 1987).

Table 1

Delinquent Juveniles Held in Public Juvenile Facilities, 1985

Type of Delinquent Act	Number of Juveniles		
	Total	Male	Female
Violent crimes	12,245	11,214	1,031
Murder, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault	8,656	8,096	560
Other	3,589	3,118	471
Property crimes	22,020	19,978	2,042
Burglary, arson, larceny-theft and motor-vehicle theft	16,129	14,948	1,181
Other	5,891	5,030	861
Alcohol and drug offenses	2,660	2,319	341
Public order offenses	1,936	1,505	431
Probation violations	4,557	3,652	905
All other offenses	2,668	2,261	407
Total	46,086	40,929	5,157

SOURCE: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Children in Custody, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, October 1986, p. 4.

During 1982, 523,975 juveniles and 6,225 adults were placed in the custody of public juvenile facilities.[3] These numbers include new entries,

[3]Most of the adults are "youthful offenders" in states with youthful offender statutes.

reentries, and transfers. These same facilities discharged 516,459 juveniles and 6,140 adults (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986a). Discharges include final exits, transfers, exits to supervision, and unauthorized exits. Comparing the number of people admitted and discharged from facilities provides a sense of turnover rates among the institutionalized juvenile delinquent population.

As measured on one day in 1983, 1,023 public juvenile facilities held 48,701 residents for an average population of 48 per facility. Nearly one-fourth of the public juvenile facilities operated at or above their designed capacity during 1982 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986b). The average length of confinement was 41 days, ranging from an average of 12 days for those detained pending adjudication to a mean of 163 days for those youths committed to facilities by court authorities[4] (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986a).

On a given day in 1983, the 1,023 public juvenile facilities employed 58,654 staff for an average of 57 staff per institution. On average, a facility housed nine residents for every 10 staff members. The resident-to-staff ratios for full-time employees, separated by staff function, were as follows (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986b):

- 49 residents per 10 treatment and education staff members
- 22 residents per 10 youth supervision staff members
- 43 residents per 10 other staff members

---

[4]The Bureau of Justice Statistics defines adjudication status in the following manner: (a) detained--awaiting adjudication, disposition, or placement; (b) committed--adjudicated for an offense or for treatment; (c) voluntarily admitted--admitted by self or referred, without adjudication, by parents, the court, or a social agency.

Until this point our discussion has focused on all types of facilities without differentiating between state- and locally-administered ones. Of all juvenile facilities, about 44 percent are state-administered (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986a). About 20 percent of the state facilities are short-term and mainly house juveniles awaiting adjudication, commitment, or placement; the remainder are long-term facilities, which are primarily for juveniles who have been adjudicated, committed, or placed for treatment (Table 2).[5] The long-term state juvenile facilities are fairly evenly

Table 2

Number of State Juvenile Facilities and Residents by Type of Facility, 1983 and 1985

	1983	1985
Facilities	444	455
Short-term	82	86
Institutional	68	81
Open	14	5
Long-term	362	369
Institutional	187	199
Open	175	170
Juvenile residents	31,156	31,014
Short-term	3,808	3,602
Institutional	3,107	3,528
Open	701	74
Long-term	27,348	27,412
Institutional	21,743	22,325
Open	5,605	5,087

Note: Data are for February 1 of each year.

SOURCE: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Children in Custody, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, 1986, p. 4.

[5]The distinction between long-term and short-term facilities in terms of a juvenile's actual length of stay is not clear.

divided between those with an institutional environment, which allows very limited access to the community and which tightly controls movement within the facility, and those that are open, providing frequent community access and placing minimal restraints on residents' movement within the facility. Many more juvenile residents are located in long-term institutional settings than in other arrangements.

The average operating costs for all state and local public juvenile facilities in 1984-85 were $25,200 per resident per year, though costs vary substantially by state (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986a). Across all facilities, the average cost per placement in an open facility is more than twice that of an institutional facility (Table 3).

Table 3

Average Per-Day and Per-Placement Operating Costs in Public Juvenile Facilities, 1984

Operating Costs	All Facilities	Short-Term Facilities	Long-Term Facilities
Average cost to house one resident for 1 day			
All environments	$69	$76	$66
Institutional	72	76	69
Open	56	81	54
Average cost per placement			
All environments	$2,799	$1,009	$11,433
Institutional	2,557	999	12,969
Open	6,028	1,420	7,737

SOURCE: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Children in Custody, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, October 1986, p. 6.

Eighty-two percent of the 49,332 juveniles held in custody as of February 1, 1985, were between the ages of 14 and 17, with the remainder falling between 18 and 20 years of age (11 percent) and 10 and 13 years (6 percent).[6] These youths also tended to be white (61 percent); male (86 percent); and to have been committed to the facility (70 percent) rather than detained or voluntarily admitted. However, Black and Hispanic youths are disproportionately represented among the population held in public juvenile facilities (Table 4).

A few studies have examined juvenile delinquency rates and characteristics of juvenile delinquents. Two studies examined two cohorts in Philadelphia at a 13-year interval. The first covered a sample of youths born in 1945; the second covered a sample group born in 1958. Remarkably similar percentages of youths had contacts before their 18th birthday: 35 percent in one cohort and 33 percent in the other. Of the juvenile delinquents in the first cohort, 46 percent were one-time delinquents, 35 percent were nonchronic recidivists, and 18 percent were chronic recidivists; of the juveniles in the second cohort, 42 percent were one-time delinquents, 35 percent were nonchronic recidivists, and 23 percent were chronic recidivists. Both studies found that a small group of chronic offenders--7 percent of the birth cohorts--were responsible for the majority of juvenile crimes. Yet, some disturbing trends emerged from the research: less than 1 percent of the offenses committed by the earlier cohort were classified as severe, compared to 20 percent for the later cohort. From the first to the second cohort, the rate of crimes committed per 1,000 youths doubled for rape and aggravated assault, tripled for murder, and increased

[6]The remaining one percent were nine years of age or younger.

Table 4

Demographic Characteristics and Adjudication Status of Juveniles Held in Public Juvenile Facilities, 1985[a]

Characteristic	Number of Juveniles
Total	49,322
Sex	
male	42,549
female	6,773
Race	
white	29,969
black	18,269
other[b]	1,084
Ethnicity	
Hispanic	6,551
non-Hispanic	42,771
Age on census date	
9 years and under	60
10-13 years	3,181
14-17 years	40,640
18-20 years	5,409
21 years and over	32
Adjudication status	
detained	14,474
committed	34,549
voluntarily admitted	299

[a]Data are for February 1, 1985.
[b]American Indians, Alaskan natives, Asians and Pacific Islanders.

SOURCE: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Children in Custody, Washington, DC, October 1986, p. 3.

fivefold for robbery (Tracy et al., 1985). Thus, more youths are repeat offenders, and they are committing more severe crimes (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985). The effect of this change in the population on the Chapter 1 N or D program is not known.

Youths in the Adult Criminal Justice System

Two types of youths who may be eligible for Chapter 1 services are found in adult correctional facilities: those who have reached the age of majority and are considered adults (generally 18 through 20); and those who are still classified as minors, but whose offense or behavior warrants treatment in the adult criminal justice system. (The former group is rarely distinguished from other adult inmates in research or other literature.)

Depending on the criminal act, the offender, and applicable state statutes, some juveniles may be tried in adult courts and sentenced to adult facilities. Juveniles may be charged and sentenced as adults under one of three mechanisms (Gragg, 1986): (1) after a hearing, the juvenile court waives its jurisdiction and sends the case to adult criminal court for trial; (2) the prosecutor has the option to file certain types of cases in adult court rather than juvenile court; or (3) certain offenses or juveniles may be excluded from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. Two reasons generally account for youths under the age of majority[7] being subject to the adult criminal justice process: either the criminal act committed by the juvenile is so heinous that authorities believe the youth must be confined

[7]The "age of majority" is the age at which a juvenile court no longer has original jurisdiction over an individual for offenses. In 1982, the age of majority was 18 in 38 states and the District of Columbia. The age of majority was 17 in eight states (Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas), 16 in three states (Connecticut, New York, and North Carolina), and 19 in one state (Wyoming; Nimick et al., 1985).

for more time than available in the juvenile justice system, or the treatment options available through the juvenile justice system do not appear to be appropriate for the individual (Gillespie, n.d.).

Although the figures are somewhat dated and limited,[8] a 1974 census of state prisons indicated that about 48,000 (25.6 percent) sentenced inmates were under 21 (Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1979). Staff at the U.S. Department of Justice estimate that as of mid-year 1986, approximately 41,000 youths under the age of 21 resided in state adult correctional facilities (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1987a).

Information about the types of crimes committed by juveniles who are charged as adults is limited. One study examined a total of 321 juveniles involved in 344 cases in 12 jurisdictions that were heard in adult criminal court. The most frequent lead charge against these youths was robbery, followed by burglary charges (Table 5).

Treatment options for individuals found guilty through the criminal justice system are broad, though not as flexible as those in the juvenile justice system. Depending on the severity of the crime, the character and history of the adjudicated individual, and particular conditions (e.g., the degree of prison overcrowding), the court may assign a person to supervised probation, community-based correction, jail, or prison (Inciardi, 1987).

As of mid-year 1987, the 50 states and the District of Columbia report a total of 602 adult correctional institutions: 532 for men, 52 for women, and 18 for both men and women (Travisono, 1988). At the end of 1986, state correctional facilities housed 502,251 individuals, of whom 97 percent were

---

[8]The data were presented by age only in relation to the inmate's job status prior to incarceration.

Table 5

Charges Against Juveniles Heard in Adult Courts

Lead Charge	Percent of Sample
Robbery	30.0
Burglary	23.8
Sexual assault	9.0
Murder	8.7
Felony assault	7.0
Other delinquency	5.2
Other felony	5.2
Felony theft	4.7
Kidnapping	3.2
Attempted murder	2.6
Felony arson	0.6

SOURCE: Frances Gragg, "Juveniles in Adult Court: A Review of Transfers at the Habitual Serious and Violent Juvenile Offender Sites," AIR-42500-WP-10/86, Working Paper prepared for the Office of Juvenile and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Assistance, Research and Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, October 1986.

sentenced to more than one year (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1987b). Nineteen percent were in maximum security facilities, 13 percent in close security facilities, 38 percent in medium security facilities, and 26 percent in minimum security facilities (Travisono, 1988). The rate of incarceration--defined as the number of prisoners per 100,000 population--increased from 8 in the 1950s and 1960s to 17 in 1985 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1986c).[9]

Overcrowded prisons are common. Forty-one states reported that they were operating at approximately 100 percent or more of their lowest

[9]The incarceration rate dropped to 5 per 100,000 population in 1970, then began a steady rise to its current level.

capacity; 32 of these housed populations that met or exceeded their highest capacities; and three states exceeded their highest capacities by more than 50 percent (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1987b).[10]

Over 95 percent of the states' inmates are men, though the number of women inmates increased at a rate about twice that of men in 1986 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1987b). About half of the prisoners are white, 46 percent are black, 1 percent are American Indian or Alaskan native, and the remainder are other races or unknown. Approximately 9 percent of the total state prison population is Hispanic (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1987c).

Data from 30 states--representing 63 percent of all prisoners admitted to state institutions in 1983--show that three-fourths of the prison admissions were new court commitments, defined as people without prior prison time on the offenses for which they were admitted. An additional 18 percent of prison admissions were people who had violated parole (Beck and Hester, 1986). About half of those admitted to prison had been convicted of burglary (26 percent), robbery (14 percent), or larceny (11 percent). The median sentence for those admitted to prison in 1983 was 36 months; the median time served, including that spent in jail, for those released in 1983 was 19 months (Table 6). Violent offenders were expected to be incarcerated for at least twice as long as property offenders and drug offenders (Beck and Hester, 1986).

Research consistently points to the linkage between juvenile delinquency and adult criminal behavior. One study tracked juveniles in

---

[10]The overcrowded conditions are exacerbated because prisons generally require reserve space to operate. Prison dormitories and cells must be maintained and repaired periodically, protective custody and disciplinary cases sometimes require special housing, and space may be needed for emergencies (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1987a).

Table 6

State Prison Admissions, Sentence Length, and Time Served by Type of Offense[a]

Most Serious Offense	Percent of Admissions	Sentence Length		Time served in Jail and Prison	
		Median	Mean	Median	Mean
All Offenses	100.0%	36 mos.	72 mos.	19 mos.	26.1 mos.
Violent Offenses	38.9%	60	100	30	38.2
Murder	3.7	Life	281	79	89.8
Manslaughter	2.6	72	96	32	35.8
Rape	2.6	84	117	47	54.3
Other sexual assault	3.7	72	108	29	34.4
Robbery	16.4	60	91	30	36.3
Assault	6.8	48	72	24	28.5
Kidnapping	1.3	84	120	33	41.3
Other violent	1.8	36	73	14	18.5
Property Offenses	46.3%	36	58	15	19.4
Burglary	25.8	36	61	17	21.0
Arson	0.7	48	81	21	24.6
Auto theft	1.8	24	41	15	17.3
Forgery/fraud	5.2	36	53	15	19.4
Larceny	10.4	24	55	12	16.2
Stolen property	1.4	36	50	13	18.1
Other property	1.0	24	55	12	15.9
Drug Offenses	8.2%	36	53	15	18.9
Public Order Offenses	4.7%	24	45	10	13.0
Other Offenses	1.9%	24	27	16	17.8

[a]Data are based on information from 30 states.

SOURCE: A. J. Beck and T. Hester, Prison Admissions and Releases, 1983, Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, March 1986, pp. 3-4.

Columbus, Ohio, who had been arrested for at least one violent or assaultive crime. The research found that almost 60 percent were arrested at least once as a young adult for a felony offense. Those who became adult criminals were more likely to be male, first arrested at age 12 or younger, chronic juvenile offenders, and to have committed violent offenses as juveniles. Yet, fully half of the arrested juveniles who were later arrested as adults had never been committed to a state juvenile delinquent facility (Hamparian, 1985).

EDUCATION IN THE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

Correctional facilities may offer multiple services to inmates, such as education, training, and employment (Parker, 1985). Providing education in a correctional facility forces direct confrontation among the multiple goals institutionalization or imprisonment is designed to achieve: protection for the community from offenders, punishment of offenders, and/or rehabilitation of offenders (Education Commission of the States, 1976; Nixon and Bumbarger, 1984). How a given facility, organization, or official chooses from these purposes--or attaches priorities to them--can significantly drive the resulting education program.

Juvenile delinquents and young adult offenders often possess characteristics that can inhibit successful learning while they are incarcerated (Roberts, 1979, p. 27):

> They include high school drop-outs who had a lengthy history of truancy before finally quitting school; those who, when they were in class, exhibited behavior problems; street-wise youths and adults who resent being talked down to and who, although their reading aptitude might be at the fifth or sixth grade level, would quickly turn off to educational materials which were geared toward the 11-year-old sixth grader in the public schools.

Among adult prison inmates the level of educational achievement is dismally low:

- Based on achievement test scores, 42 percent of incarcerated offenders function below the fifth-grade level (Bell et al., 1984).
- Only 28 percent of the population in adult correctional facilities had four years of high school or more; 46 percent had one to three years of high school; and 25 percent had less than a ninth grade education (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1979).

Education programs in correctional facilities operate in unique settings, where three types of conflict may affect the structure and effectiveness of education programs: staff conflict, inmate conflict, and institutional conflict (Bartell et al., 1977; Bell et al., 1979; Horvath, 1982; Reffett, 1983). Staff conflict is most prevalent between those responsible for security--the custody staff--and those responsible for administering the educational program--the treatment staff. Guards may perceive teachers as too lenient and not oriented toward discipline and order; teachers may see the constant presence of custody staff as disruptive and counterproductive.

Inmate conflicts, especially those that are race-related and gang-related, may limit useful and productive participation in educational programs. In at least one instance, white prisoners refused to attend classes after black prisoners began to attend the same classes; sometimes entire education programs are suspended because of inmate conflict.

The third type of conflict is a product of the nature of the correctional facility. First, the institution's role is often unclear: some segments of society view incarceration as punishment for antisocial activity, while other segments see it as an opportunity for rehabilitation and reintegration into society. For an administrator with limited resources

who must choose between security and treatment personnel to staff the facility, these conflicting pressures can become acute. Second, the educational program in the correctional facility may be frequently disrupted. While most institutions tend to follow very structured schedules, a given inmate may not regularly attend class because of obligations such as work release, special confinement, or home visits. Such activities, coupled with the short and often uncertain length of institutionalization, result in an unstable educational environment. Additionally, staff shortages, cancelled classes, and lack of facilities may delay or suspend services to confined youths.

The correctional environment and the characteristics of institutionalized youths can create barriers to education. Many prisons are located at a distance from urban areas, thus limiting the availability of teachers who can be recruited and the types of programs that can be offered (Education Commission of the States, 1976). Education programs in correctional facilities are frequently inferior to those of the public schools in educational methods, teacher preparation, materials, and technology (Bell et al., 1979; Dell'Apa, 1973; Reagen and Stoughton, 1976). Funding is often from "soft" sources (Bell et al., 1979). Establishing rapport with and motivating students may require extraordinary skills and commitment (Meussling, 1984; Williams et al., 1984).

Educators in correctional facilities confront numerous other problems. Residents enter throughout the year, thus limiting a teacher's ability to plan and coordinate instruction. Many institutions have high turnover rates: youths are moved to other facilities, released from the facility, or reassigned to different sectors within the same facility that may not offer

particular educational courses. Education may be regularly interrupted for several reasons, such as when a student is disciplined and not allowed to attend classes, when the entire school is shut down during a general lockup, or when youths miss class because of appointments with a doctor or lawyer.

Even given these conflicts and barriers, education programs are an integral component of the treatment that juvenile delinquents and adult prisoners receive. Data from 1984 indicate that 92 percent of institutionalized juvenile offenders were served in education programs; 30 percent of incarcerated adults participated in education programs (Nelson et al., 1985). Obviously, one reason for the significantly higher percentage of juvenile participants is that many are required to attend school, either by the sentencing court or by state compulsory school attendance laws (Education Commission of the States, 1976).

Academic Instruction

The structure of schooling in the correctional facility may take a variety of forms, depending in part on the type of facility. For juveniles, classes may constitute a major portion of their day. When sufficient numbers of youths are at the same level, or when the subject matter warrants, a teacher may use an instructional approach that entails working with the class as a whole. However, instruction is often individualized, with each student receiving separate assignments from the teacher and completing them at his own pace. Individualized instruction accomplishes three purposes: (1) it accommodates the wide range of skills likely in a given group of youths, (2) it takes into account the movement into and out of facilities that is so common among this population, and (3) it may avoid

replicating the unsuccessful school experiences that many youths previously encountered.

The academic classes offered in juvenile facilities usually fall into three types: basic skills instruction in reading, language arts, and mathematics for youths with low levels of ability; preparation to take examinations leading toward a General Educational Development (GED) certificate (sometimes referred to as the high school equivalency certificate), generally for youths who are older and more advanced in their academic achievement; and, in certain facilities, traditional high school classes, such as English, algebra, and science.

Education for adult prisoners is substantially different from that for juveniles. Adults are not generally required to attend class; they may have other options that are more appealing, such as prison work that pays more than enrolling in school. Those who choose to attend generally spend less time in class than juveniles do.

The educational offerings in adult correctional facilities may be individualized or whole-group. Instructional approaches vary across facilities and even within facilities, depending on the inmates' skill levels (i.e., low-performing students may be better served through individualized instruction), the average length of stay (i.e., prisons with longer stays may develop whole-group instruction), and the subject matter (for example, job-readiness training may be whole-group whereas literacy training may be individualized).

Often, the range of educational programs in prisons is broader than in juvenile correctional institutions. The programs may include the following (Massey and Rice, 1985):

- Adult basic education (ABE), intended for low-performing individuals whose achievement levels are generally below the eighth grade level;
- GED preparation for inmates with more advanced abilities;
- Classes that are geared to the high school level; and
- Post-secondary education programs, which may be offered in the facility, at a nearby campus, or through correspondence courses.

In addition to academic courses, juvenile delinquent and adult correctional facilities may offer life skills classes (Ramey, 1984). Life skills subjects can include job readiness, career education, values education, parenting, and interpersonal relationships.

As noted previously, the provision of effective education programs in correctional settings poses unique challenges. Some programs attempt to ameliorate the negative environmental effects and overcome participant reluctance by adopting novel approaches that include:

- Interesting vocational education training that is linked to community needs, such as courses in fire fighting, emergency medical technician classes, and corporate-sponsored computer education with guaranteed employment after release (Day and McCane, 1982).
- Training in food services, with trainees preparing meals for other inmates and prison staff (Turner, 1987).
- Study release programs that allow selected residents to leave the correctional facility and attend local schools (McCarthy and McCarthy, 1984).
- Preindustrial training that involves inmate orientation and hands-on skill training (Brent, 1986).
- A structured program for young offenders that relies on the rigid standards and strict discipline of the military (Crabtree and Douglas, 1985).
- Criterion-referenced instruction that uses an interactive computer system (Mohler, 1986).
- Construction of a full-size house within a correctional facility, which is then used to train inmates participating in a residential electricity program (Wagner, 1986).

- Arts programs in prison (Hart and Waren, 1983).

- Computer-assisted education and literacy instruction (Angle and Baldry, 1987; National Governors' Association, 1987).

- Development of computer-based curricula for other populations, such as handicapped youths and adults pursuing basic skills training, that may ultimately prove useful for juvenile delinquents and adult offenders (U.S. Department of Labor, 1986; U.S. Department of Education, 1986).

Vocational Instruction

Vocational education may be an important part of instruction in correctional facilities. Due to the relatively short length of stay in many juvenile delinquent facilities, the vocational education programs that exist in these settings often focus on career exploration (Day and McCane, 1982). Practitioners have begun to recognize that successful vocational education programs must be adapted to the prison environment for several reasons (Hershberger, 1987; Storck, 1985; Waidley, 1986):

- Inter-prison inmate transfers may require that offerings follow standardized formats and structure.

- Yet, vocational education in the prison does not follow a logical, developmental model as it does in other settings. Inmates are likely to have low levels of basic skills, they may be transferred, their sentences may be changed, and disciplinary actions may affect their participation.

- Because vocational courses in prisons are limited, inmates may take them not because their career interests lie there, but because nothing else is available.

- The types of programs provided must be carefully considered in relation to the likelihood of employment in that profession after release, especially given the barriers to employment an ex-offender faces.

Developments in Corrections Education

Two fairly recent developments in corrections education deserve separate mention. One is the movement to identify and appropriately treat incarcerated youths who are handicapped (Nelson et al., 1987). Surveys find

that between 28 and 42 percent of all youths committed to state juvenile facilities could be identified as handicapped under criteria specified by P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act; the incidence of handicapping conditions among the general population is about 10 percent (Morgan, 1979; Rutherford et al., 1985). Confined juveniles with special education needs are predominantly mentally retarded, learning disabled, or behaviorally disordered (Nelson, 1987). To train correctional educators serving the handicapped, the Correctional Special Education Training (C/SET) Project has developed eight modules that state corrections departments and colleges can use to train corrections educators (Rutherford and Nelson, 1986).

The second development concerns states enacting "no read, no release" policies whereby inmates are required to demonstrate functional literacy levels before they are allowed to leave the institution (Baker, 1986; Coffey, 1987; McDonald, 1986). These policies are being challenged in the courts, so their effects are uncertain. Regardless, they demonstrate increased attention to the educational needs of prisoners.

Transitional Programs and Post-Release Experiences

One purpose of education for institutionalized youths is to prepare them for re-entry into non-institutionalized settings. As an ex-offender, the youth may face numerous difficulties, such as returning to the same environment and personal circumstances that led to incarceration; changing his or her behaviors from those used in the institution to those necessary for satisfactory adjustment to open society; a lack of financial resources; limited opportunities or desires for further education; problems in securing

employment; and possible labelling by others as an identified delinquent[11] or criminal (Jones and Kravitz, 1980).

Transitional programs within the correctional facility can take numerous forms. Some may be designed to provide youths with marketable skills or study behaviors. Other efforts may include job readiness preparation, life skills training, and pre-release counseling. One new direction is a process model that coordinates planning for students who leave correctional education to return to local schools. The model, which is being pilot tested, contains more than 40 strategies that address transitional issues in the areas of interagency awareness, records transfer, preplacement planning before the youth leaves the facility, and maintaining school enrollment after release (Maddox et al., 1984).

One recent national study surveyed juvenile correctional agencies to determine the ways that states were addressing the transition of youths from facilities to their home communities (Wolford et al., 1987). Of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, 41 have written guidelines concerning the transition of youths from correctional facilities. Forty-one states (not the same ones just mentioned) have procedures for transferring school records to correctional institutions, but only 11 states report that school records are received before or at the same time that the youth enters the facility. Forty-two states have procedures to notify public schools that youths are being released and should be enrolling in school, but only 25 states report that records are transferred before or at the same time that

---

[11]Juvenile arrest and imprisonment records are statutorily protected and often sealed. The fact remains, however, that significant adults (e.g., a school principal or potential employer) and peers may be fully aware of the juvenile's previous delinquency.

the youth leaves. Youths in 45 states are placed under community supervision after their release.

Remarkably little research examines the post-release experiences of youths, especially in regard to the effects of training or preparation received in prison (Jengeleski, 1984). One field of inquiry regarding post-release experiences looks at recidivism. A recent study used data from 22 states to determine the rearrest rates for 17 to 22 year olds who were paroled in 1978. Within six years of their release, approximately 69 percent were rearrested for a serious crime, 53 percent were convicted for a new offense, and 49 percent returned to prison. The amount of prior education was related to the likelihood of rearrest: 48 percent of the parolees who had attended some college were rearrested, compared to 61 percent of the high school graduates and 71 percent of those who had not completed high school (Beck and Shipley, 1987).

Two studies specifically tracked released youths to learn of their educational experiences. A national study found that about 50 percent returned to local schools, but 80 percent of these withdrew before the end of the school term. One-third of the sample enrolled in some type of alternative school designed to address the particular needs of the released juvenile; these programs included GED preparation, adult basic education, and work-study programs (Pfannenstiel and Keesling, 1980).

The second study followed 759 youths after their release from two Wisconsin correctional facilities. Forty percent (301 youths) earned GEDs: nearly three-quarters of these students earned the GED while institutionalized and about one-quarter did so after release. Fifty percent of the sample did not complete high school or the GED. Only 12 students (1.6

percent) who returned to their communities finished high school; eight of these were from small school districts and had achievement levels of at least the seventh grade in reading and sixth grade in math at the time of entry to the correctional facility (Haberman and Quinn, 1986).

CHAPTER 1 FOR NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT YOUTHS IN STATE FACILITIES

The federally funded program of educational services for neglected or delinquent youths began operations in fiscal year 1967 through amendments to landmark legislation that had created a substantial federal role in elementary and secondary education: Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which was later superseded by Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981. Chapter 1 is best known for its program of basic grants to states, in which states award funds to local school districts to provide supplemental services for disadvantaged students. Of the nearly $4 billion currently appropriated for Chapter 1, $3.5 billion is designated for this purpose. Chapter 1 also authorizes three smaller programs that provide services for children from migrant families, for children in state-operated or supported facilities for the handicapped, and for students in state-operated or supported institutions for the neglected or delinquent (N or D).

A review of congressional hearings that led to the enactment of the N or D program shows that the primary concern was for orphans and children in foster homes--not for those in correctional facilities, who now constitute most of the N or D recipients in state-run institutions.[12] A representative of the corrections community introduced the idea of serving the delinquent

---

[12]The shift in beneficiaries of services reflects societal trends, namely that fewer orphanages exist and that children in foster homes tend to attend regular public or private schools.

population in testimony delivered before a U.S. House of Representatives subcommittee (Madison, 1966, pp. 1295-1296):

> I want to speak for another segment of our young population, not included in [the bill under consideration], and not provided for in the elementary and secondary education pact. Those are the boys and girls in the institutions serving delinquent youth across the country . . . . There is now in institutions serving delinquent youth in the United States the greatest congregation of unlearned, uncared for, unwanted, unloved, and undisciplined young people to be found in the country. . .

Currently funded at $32,616,000, the Chapter 1 N or D program authorizes grants to state agencies for programs to meet the special educational needs of children in state facilities for neglected or delinquent youths. The program has been level-funded since fiscal year 1982; comparing appropriation amounts with constant dollar levels shows that Chapter 1 N or D funds now buy less than in 1968--the second year of the program (Riddle, 1985).

A state's N or D grant is determined by a formula that takes into account (1) average daily attendance (ADA)[13] in state-operated or supported institutions and (2) the state's average per pupil expenditure data. For expenditures in the 1987-88 school year, the state grants ranged from a low of $8,000 in Rhode Island to a high of $3.5 million in New York (Table 7).

Three studies of the Chapter 1 N or D program have been conducted. The U.S. General Accounting Office examined the then-Title I program from an educational standpoint and assessed the ways the program related to the broader social issues of juvenile delinquency and child abuse and neglect (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1977). A large, multi-year study was conducted in the late 1970s that examined N or D program participant

---

[13]Regulations specify in detail the means for calculating the ADA figures (see 34 CFR 203). Determining these figures, however, remains difficult for states, as discussed later in this paper.

Table 7

1987-88 Average Daily Attendance and Grant Amounts by State

State	Population			Grant
	Juvenile (ADA)	Adult (ADA)	Total	
Alabama	—	—	600[d]	367,404
Alaska	206	—	206	189,213
Arizona	—	—	824[b]	524,844
Arkansas	251	207	458	280,452
California	3,274	956	4,230	3,042,833
Colorado	428	21	449	370,379
Connecticut	163[a]	416	579	531,818
Delaware	147	22	169	155,228
Florida	655	1,287	1,942	1,382,423
Georgia	694	589	1,283	785,633
Hawaii	127	—	127	97,959
Idaho	—	—	145[b]	88,789
Illinois	—	—	1,434[c]	1,120,081
Indiana	265[a]	1,017	1,282	872,439
Iowa	362[a]	101	463	357,755
Kansas	—	—	777[d]	616,606
Kentucky	658	54	712	435,987
Louisiana	107	846	953	618,043
Maine	—	—	277[b]	185,363
Maryland	1,078	170	1,248	1,135,990
Massachusetts	507	133	640	572,244
Michigan	826	741	1,567	1,332,099
Minnesota	—	—	257[b]	210,482
Mississippi	344	195	539	330,052
Missouri	269	115	384	251,212
Montana	—	—	200[b]	171,063
Nebraska	16[a]	139	155	119,485
Nevada	313	0	313	196,025
New Hampshire	107[a]	6	113	82,030
New Jersey	—	—	1,533[b]	1,408,077
New Mexico	382	86	468	322,844
New York	1,915	1,922	3,837	3,524,327
North Carolina	787	961	1,748	1,070,372
North Dakota	89	0	89	65,678
Ohio	1,936[a]	333	2,269	1,656,918
Oklahoma	168[a]	89	257	161,829
Oregon	—	—	919[d]	794,379
Pennsylvania	—	—	1,260[c]	1,157,324
Rhode Island	—	—	9[b]	8,267
South Carolina	814[a]	418	1,232	754,404
South Dakota	—	—	148[b]	93,697
Tennessee	297[a]	1,134	1,431	876,260
Texas	1,540[a]	560	2,100	1,446,750
Utah	312[a]	12	324	198,398
Vermont	64	103	167	134,915
Virginia	—	—	920[d]	644,883
Washington	—	—	93[b]	76,948
West Virginia	79[a]	195	274	196,043
Wisconsin	737[a]	0	737	625,851
Wyoming	180	0	180	165,332
Washington, D.C.	280	354	634	582,336
Puerto Rico	409	301	710	226,237

[a]The ADA count probably includes children in both neglected and delinquent facilities.
[b]The ADA count probably includes children in both adult and juvenile facilities.
[c]The ADA count probably includes children in neglected, juvenile, and adult facilities.
[d]The ADA count cannot be disaggregated into juvenile and adult figures.

characteristics, educational services, effective practices, and students' post-release experiences (Bartell et al., 1977; Keesling et al., 1979; Pfannenstiel, 1979; Pfannenstiel et al., 1980; Pfannenstiel and Keesling, 1980). The third study examined program administration and operations in a limited number of sites (Marks, 1986).

Statutory and Regulatory Provisions

Youths in three types of state-administered facilities are eligible for Chapter 1 N or D services: (1) institutions for the care of children in the custody of a public agency as a result of a determination of neglect under state law, (2) institutions for the care of children in the custody of a public agency as a result of a determination under state law that they are delinquent, and (3) adult correctional institutions. The institutions for neglected or delinquent children must have residents who stay for an average of at least 30 days. To be eligible for Chapter 1 services, a youth must be under 21, lack a high school diploma or its equivalent, and be enrolled for at least 10 hours per week in an organized program of instruction supported by nonfederal funds (34 CFR 203).

Chapter 1 N or D grants are awarded to state educational agencies (SEAs). SEAs, in turn, award funds to eligible state applicant agencies (SAAs) that are responsible for providing free public education to youths in institutions for the neglected or delinquent or in adult correctional facilities. These state applicant agencies are often a department of corrections or a division of youth services within a department of human resources.

Certain restrictions apply to the Chapter 1 N or D program (34 CFR 203). Regulations require a state applicant agency to base its Chapter 1

project on an annual assessment of the educational needs of the institutionalized youths. The assessment must: (1) ensure that students who have the greatest need for special assistance are selected for services and (2) sufficiently specify students' educational needs to guarantee concentration on them. The SAA must meet Chapter 1's "maintenance of effort" requirement, meaning that the nonfederal funds expended on education in the previous fiscal year must be at least 90 percent of the nonfederal funds spent for education in the second preceding year. SAAs are to evaluate the projects at least once every three years and assure that the projects are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to "give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting the special educational needs of children being served." The state applicant agency must design and implement the Chapter 1 project in consultation with N or D teachers and, to the extent feasible, with parents.

Chapter 1 funds must be used to meet the "special educational needs" of children in institutions for the neglected or delinquent. In addition, Chapter 1 services must supplement, not supplant, the educational services that the facilities provide. To ensure that services are supplemental, regulations require that facilities provide a minimum of 10 hours per week of an organized program of instruction funded from nonfederal sources.

Chapter 1 N or D Program Administration

The Chapter 1 N or D program is different from most other federally funded elementary and secondary education programs that operate within a school system or instructional setting. The N or D program crosses state agency boundaries and must fit within an organizational structure that does not have education as its top priority. Moreover, the N or D program falls

under the jurisdiction of local facility officials who, although they consider education important, see it as secondary to the mental health needs of institutionalized youths (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1977).

Administrative responsibilities are divided between the SEA and its SAAs. Most SEA program activities center on application review and approval. SEA staff do not often conduct monitoring visits or provide facility-level technical assistance. In some respects, the N or D program receives a level of attention from SEAs commensurate with the small size of its funding relative to the basic Chapter 1 grants program.

The state applicant agency is responsible for administering and implementing the N or D program. Several models of SAA administration are used (Coffey, 1986):

- Ten states have special school districts for corrections education (Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia).
- In Alabama, a technical college is under contract to provide corrections education.
- Washington contracts with its regional community college system for correctional education.
- Nevada provides corrections education through an agreement with a local educational agency.

SAA staff generally determine which facilities will receive Chapter 1 funds, provide technical assistance, and monitor programs. Many SAAs have an education program coordinator, reflecting the importance that schooling now takes in the correctional system.

Day-to-day program operations are handled at the facility level. In 1983-84, fifteen states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico had a total of 44 state-operated facilities serving neglected youths that received Chapter 1 funds. All states except Rhode Island had state institutions for

delinquent youths participating in the Chapter 1 program; these types of facilities made up over half of all facilities receiving N or D funds (333 of 591). All but five states had adult correctional facilities, numbering 215 in total, participating in Chapter 1 (Table 8).

Many facilities have an accredited school (sometimes in a separate building) headed by a principal, who reports to a warden or facility superintendent. Facility-level staff generally determine what services to offer, hire teachers, and select students for Chapter 1. The SAA incorporates the facility's program plans into the application it submits to the SEA.

Characteristics of Chapter 1 N or D Students and Programs

The number of youths eligible for Chapter 1 N or D services has grown from 45,000 in the mid-1970s to nearly 80,000 a decade later (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1977; Marks, 1986). The national study of the N or D program estimated that in 1976 52 percent of the youths eligible for N or D received services (Pfannenstiel and Keesling, 1980). Since that study was conducted, the number of participating facilities has increased from about 475 to nearly 600 (Pfannenstiel and Keesling, 1980; Marks, 1986), and the percentage of the eligible youths who received services increased to 74 percent.

The national study of the N or D program and population reported the following characteristics of the then-Title I participants (Bartell et al., 1977; Keesling et al., 1979):

- One-third of the youths were 18-20 years old, 30 percent were 16-17, and 25 percent were 14-15. Neglected institutions generally had the youngest students.

Table 8

Number of Facilities Participating in the Chapter 1 N or D Program by State, 1983-84

State	Facilities for Neglected Youths	Juvenile Delinquent Facilities	Adult Correctional Facilities
Alabama	0	3	0
Alaska	0	4	2
Arizona	0	4	2
Arkansas	0	2	5
California	0	17	7
Colorado	0	5	1
Connecticut	1	1	8
Delaware	0	2	2
Florida	0	3	9
Georgia	0	5	4
Hawaii	0	1	0
Idaho	0	1	1
Illinois	4	10	11
Indiana	1	7	7
Iowa	1	1	1
Kansas	6	8	1
Kentucky	0	14	5
Louisiana	0	4	6
Maine	0	2	1
Maryland	0	3	7
Massachusetts	0	17	7
Michigan	0	12	4
Minnesota	0	3	1
Mississippi	0	2	1
Missouri	0	8	4
Montana	0	2	2
Nebraska	1	1	1
Nevada	0	2	0
New Hampshire	0	1	1
New Jersey	0	18	4
New Mexico	0	2	3
New York	0	64	28
North Carolina	0	5	8
North Dakota	0	1	0
Ohio	1	9	4
Oklahoma	0	2	4
Oregon	6	4	3
Pennsylvania	1	11	5
Rhode Island	0	0	1
South Carolina	1	3	6
South Dakota	0	2	1
Tennessee	1	5	3
Texas	1	5	21
Utah	10	10	2
Vermont	0	4	6
Virginia	0	7	4
Washington	1	18	2
West Virginia	1	3	2
Wisconsin	0	2	4
Wyoming	0	2	0
Washington, DC	3	3	1
Puerto Rico	4	8	2
TOTAL	44	333	215

Source: E. L. Marks, An Analysis of ECIA Chapter 1 State Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children, Policy Studies Associates, Washington, DC, 1986, p. 10.

- In neglected facilities, 46 percent of the Title I participants were minorities; the proportion of minority participants reached 54 percent in delinquent facilities and 62 percent in adult correctional facilities. The minority composition of program participants paralleled the resident population, except that blacks appeared to be underrepresented in Title I programs in neglected facilities.

- When compared with the general institutional population, Title I students included slightly more females.

- Students reported that, on the average, they had last attended ninth grade before entering the facility.

- Title I students had been previously institutionalized more often than other facility students (among all students, the number of previous commitments averaged 2-1/2).

The facilities participating in Title I varied widely on several key factors (Keesling et al., 1979). The median length of stay was 7.5 months while the mean and standard deviation were 13.7 and 15.2 months, respectively. Institutions averaged a resident population of 407, with a median of 164 residents. On a typical day, the median number of residents participating in all education programs was 99 (with a mean of 134 and a standard deviation of 124); the median number of residents participating in a Title I instructional program was 30 (with a mean of 53 and standard deviation of 56).

Chapter 1 funds generally account for a small, but not insubstantial, portion of the education budget. The national evaluation conducted in the late 1970s reported that Title I constituted nearly 24 percent of facilities' education budgets (Keesling et al., 1979); a later study of selected sites found that Chapter 1 funds accounted for about 14 percent of these facilities' education budgets (Marks, 1986). Most of the difference between the two studies probably results from the fact that the second study does not contain nationally representative information; however, some

observers believe that funding patterns have in fact changed and the amount of state dollars for education programs in facilities, relative to Chapter 1 dollars, has increased.

Typically, Chapter 1 services are delivered as supplemental reading and mathematics instruction, with teachers generally individualizing lesson content to meet student needs (Keesling et al., 1979; Marks, 1986). The assessment of Title I students' instructional time conducted in the national study found that those youths did not regularly attend classes: attendance in all reading classes (Title I or basic education) ranged between 90 and 100 percent, but youths enrolled in supplemental services in both reading and mathematics attended all classes at markedly lower rates than their peers (Table 9).

The national study of Title I N or D programs drew several additional conclusions pertinent to future research. They include (Pfannenstiel and Keesling, 1980):

- Some Title I programs were clearly structured and separate from other instruction, whereas a few Title I programs could not be readily identified as such.
- An institution's orientation toward rehabilitation versus punishment affects Title I program operations; those placing a higher priority on rehabilitation regard education as a particularly important treatment option.
- Nearly all institutions require that their teachers are certified by the state. Ninety percent of the surveyed facilities reported problems in recruiting their teaching staff; about one-half reported problems in retaining their Title I staff.
- On the average, Title I programs produced no changes in students' achievement levels and attitudinal measures over a 12-week period.

Table 9

Weekly Instructional Time

Minutes of Instruction Per week in	Student is Enrolled in a Program of		
	Basic Education Instruction Only	Basic Education Plus Title I Supplement in Reading & Mathematics	Basic Education Plus Title I Supplement in Reading Only
Non-Title I Reading			
Scheduled	250	90	65
Held	230	85	60
Attended	230	80	60
Title I Reading			
Scheduled	n/a	165	190
Held	n/a	135	185
Attended	n/a	95	165
Non-Title I Mathematics			
Scheduled	160	190	195
Held	150	190	185
Attended	115	70	155
Title I Mathematics			
Scheduled	n/a	230	n/a
Held	n/a	225	n/a
Attended	n/a	75	n/a
Total Reading			
Scheduled	300	255	255
Held	280	220	245
Attended	280	175	225
Total Mathematics			
Scheduled	160	420	195
Held	150	415	185
Attended	115	145	155

SOURCE: J. W. Keesling et al., Compensatory Education and Confined Youth: A National Evaluation of Title I Programs in State Institutions for Neglected or Delinquent Youth, Volume 2, System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, 1979, p. 79.

- Adult correctional facilities housed a substantial portion (43 percent) of the youths eligible for N or D services, but only about one-third of the eligible population participated in Title I programs. A majority of these institutions have less than 45 eligible youths, which may be too few to warrant the establishment and support of a special program.

The degree to which each of these findings from the 1976 study still hold true is an important issue of inquiry for the current study.

The national study also included a survey that examined the post-release experiences of youths who participated in the Title I program. Although the samples are small, this follow-up study indicates that (Pfannenstiel and Keesling, 1980):

- Approximately half of the respondents entered school following their release from the facility.
- Half of the students experienced difficulties in transferring to local schools, often due to their own perceptions that they were performing below a level expected by the receiving schools.
- Eighty-five percent of the released youths intended to continue their education, planning to obtain at least a high school diploma or GED certificate.
- Seventy-two percent of the youths held a job at some point after their release; 40 to 50 percent of them were employed at the time of the follow-up interview, generally in jobs requiring unskilled labor. The youths expressed widespread dissatisfaction with their jobs.
- About one-third of the youths reported they had committed offenses since their release. Ten to 20 percent had been reinstitutionalized by the time of the follow-up reports.

A small scale survey examined the post-release educational experiences of N or D youths (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1977). Sixty-eight percent enrolled in school; only half of these were still enrolled 15 months later, one-third of whom had poor attendance. Twenty-six percent of the sample did not enroll in school, with "lack of interest" given as the most

common reason for not continuing their education.[14] A clear relationship between age and subsequent school enrollments and attendance emerged: younger youths were more likely than older ones to enroll in school and attend regularly.

Programmatic Information Available in U.S. Department of Education Files

Members of the study team reviewed all files kept by the U.S. Department of Education's (ED's) Office of Compensatory Education Programs, which administers the Chapter 1 N or D program. Two purposes guided this activity: to collect any general or specific information not previously obtained and to gather data that might prove useful in developing subsequent research activities.

The program office files contain relatively little information on N or D. To reduce administrative paperwork, as required by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, ED no longer requires SEAs to submit applications to Washington. Instead, states themselves are to maintain the proper documents. Thus, the applications that had previously provided at least some broad programmatic descriptions are not available at ED.

In a similar spirit of reducing administrative paperwork, the U.S. Office of Management and Budget determined that ED's request for SEAs to submit ADA counts by type of facility (i.e., neglected, juvenile, and adult correctional) was unnecessarily burdensome. States now submit only the ADA counts by state applicant agency (e.g., department of corrections,

---

[14]Of the 45 youths constituting the 26 percent who did not enter school, nine had received a high school diploma or GED certificate while institutionalized.

department of youth services).[15] Thus, researchers have no access to current information that lists even the types of facilities eligible for the Chapter 1 N or D program.[16]

About the only available information is the reports from program review teams that ED sends out to examine Chapter 1 operations. Each state is visited about once every two years. Because the focus of the review is the Chapter 1 basic grants program, some monitoring reports never mention N or D. The monitors found more to criticize than to commend regarding Chapter 1 state N or D programs. Calculating average daily attendance was problematic in numerous states, as was determining student eligibility. The areas in which N or D programs received praise included the quality of educational efforts and resulting pupil achievement.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has reviewed and summarized available information on the neglected or delinquent youth population, on education programs for delinquent youths, and on the Chapter 1 program that serves a portion of that population residing in state-operated or state-supported facilities. This information has many shortcomings. Existing evaluative research is scant, the literature has little common focus, and findings are often not generalizable because of the limited scope of past studies. The Chapter 1 N or D study that Westat is conducting provides an opportunity to help fill three pronounced gaps in the current knowledge base:

---

[15]The data--ADA counts by state applicant agency--are presented in Table 7 of this paper.

[16]The most recent list of facilities with eligible Chapter 1 populations is from 1983-84 (Marks, 1986).

- Administrative linkages--little information addresses coordination between the SEA and the SAAs, between the SAA and its constituent facilities, and between Chapter 1 and other education programs within the facility.

- Classroom operations--little information is available about the characteristics and qualifications of teachers in N or D facilities; few studies examine curricula or educational accomplishments.

- Effects of societal changes--much of the existing data predate important societal changes that are likely to affect the types of program participants and activities; for example, fewer youths are in juvenile delinquent facilities (due to the use of community-based treatment for less serious offenses), yet more youths may be in adult correctional facilities (because of the seriousness of their crimes and behavior).

- Status of educational programs and Chapter 1 services in correctional facilities--the societal changes listed previously, coupled with changes in corrections education (such as enhanced staff training and the increased importance of education in institutions) may have produced shifts in the status of programs, but the magnitude and direction of these shifts are unknown.

Appendix

Information Sources Used to Identify and Locate Existing Materials

FEDERAL AGENCIES

U.S. Department of Education

Grants and Contracts
Office of Compensatory Education Programs

U.S. Department of Justice

Bureau of Prisons
Juvenile Justice Information Division
Juvenile Statistics
National Criminal Justice Reference Service
Office of Research
States' Assistance Division

U.S. Department of Labor

Employment and Training Administration
Job Corps
Office of Strategic Planning and Evaluation

U.S. Department of Treasury

Office of Tax Analysis

CORRECTIONS REFERENCE SOURCES

American Correctional Association
National Center for Juvenile Justice
National Council of Juvenile Family Court Judges
National Institute of Corrections
U.S. Sentencing Commission

SOURCES FOR EDUCATION AND RELATED AREAS

American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees
Control Data Corporation
Education Commission of the States
Education Resources Information Center
National Center for Vocational Education
National Education Association
National Governors' Association
Rand Corporation
Research for Better Schools

REFERENCES

Angle, T., and J. Baldry (1987). Dynamic custody at work: The PLATO computer-based education project at Millbrook Correctional Centre and the Ontario Correctional Institute. Journal of Correctional Education, v.38, n.3, pp. 120-123.

Baker, D. (1986, February 11). "'No Read, No Release' Policy Ordered in Va. Prison Paroles," The Washington Post, pp. A1, A14.

Bartell, T., et al. (1977). Compensatory Education and Confined Youth: A National Evaluation of Title I Programs in State Institutions for Neglected or Delinquent Youth, Volume 1. Santa Monica, CA: Systems Development Corporation.

Beck, A. J., and T. Hester (1986). Prison Admissions and Releases, 1983. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

——— and B. E. Shipley (1987). Recidivism of Young Parolees. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

Bell, R., et al. (1984). The findings and recommendations of the national study on learning deficiencies in adult inmates. Journal of Correctional Education, v.34, n.2, pp.129-137.

Brent, J. E. (1986). Preindustrial training. Corrections Today, v.48, n.1, pp. 30-32.

Bureau of Justice Statistics (1979). State Inmate Survey. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

——— (1986a). Children in Custody. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

——— (1986b). Children in Custody: 1982/83 Census of Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

——— (1986c). State and Federal Prisoners, 1925-85. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

——— (1987a). Personal communication. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

——— (1987b). Prisoners in 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

——— (1987c). Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on December 31, 1984. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Coffey, O. D. (1986). Trends in the administration of correctional education. In B. I. Wolford, compiler, Correctional Education: Perspectives on

Programs for Adult Offenders. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

——— (1987). Book 'em: No read, no release. Corrections Today, v.49, n.3, pp. 116-118.

Crabtree, L., and P. Douglas (1985). Military discipline: Young offenders learn accountability. Corrections Today, v.47, n.7, pp. 38-39.

Day, S. R., and M. R. McCane (1982). Vocational Education in Corrections. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

Dell'Apa, F. (1973). Educational Programs in Adult Correctional Institutions: A Survey. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Education Commission of the States (1976). Correctional Education: A Forgotten Service. Denver, CO: author.

Gillespie, L. K. (n.d.). Juveniles in an adult world: Prison inmates under the age of eighteen. Ogden, UT: Weber State College.

Gragg, F. (1986). Juveniles in Adult Court: A Review of Transfers at the Habitual Serious and Violent Juvenile Offender Program Sites. Washington, DC: working paper AIR-42500-WP-10/86 prepared for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Assistance, Research and Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

Haberman, M., and L. M. Quinn (1986). The high school re-entry myth: A follow-up study of juveniles released from two correctional high schools in Wisconsin. Journal of Correctional Education, v. 37, n.3, pp. 114-117.

Hamparian, D. M., et al. (1985). The Young Criminal Years of the Violent Few. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.

Hart, S., and M. Waren, eds. (1983). The Arts in Prison. New York, NY: Center for Advanced Study in Theatre Arts, The Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York.

Hershberger, S. L. (1987). Vocational education: Preparing for life outside. Corrections Today, v.49, n.5, pp. 128-132.

Horvath, G. (1982). Issues in correctional education: A conundrum of conflict. Journal of Correctional Education, v.33, n.1, pp.8-15.

Inciardi, J. A. (1987). Criminal Justice. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Jengeleski, J. L. (1984). Reintegrating the ex-offender: A critique of education and employment programs. Journal of Correctional Education, v.35, n.3, pp. 90-95.

Jones, C. T., and M. Kravitz (1980). Strategies for Reintegrating the Ex-Offender. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.

Kane, B. J., and R. C. Bragg (1984). School behavior study. Journal of Correctional Education, v.35, n.4, pp. 118-122.

Keesling, J. W., et al. (1979). Compensatory Education and Confined Youth: A National Evaluation of Title I Programs in State Institutions for Neglected or Delinquent Youth, Volume 2. Santa Monica, CA: Systems Development Corporation.

Kozol, J. (1985). Illiterate America. New York: Doubleday.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (1979). Profile of State Prison Inmates: Sociodemographic Findings from the 1974 Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Maddox, M., et al. (1984). Transitioning adjudicated youth back to community schools. Journal of Correctional Education, v.35, n.4, pp. 124-128.

Madison, B. (1966). Testimony before the Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 89th Congress, 2nd session, pp. 1295-1296.

Marks, E. L. (1986). An Analysis of ECIA Chapter 1 State Programs for Neglected or Delinquent Children. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Massey, D., and B. C. Rice (1985). The education continuum. Corrections Today, v.47, n.5, pp. 26-30.

McCarthy, B. J., and B. R. McCarthy (1984). Are study release programs making the grade? Journal of Correctional Education, v.35, n.2, pp. 42-46.

McDonald, A. (1986, March 31). "Kentucky Is Doing It Too," Newsweek, p. 10.

Meussling, V. (1984). The emotional climate of the interpersonal classroom in a maximum security prison for males. Journal of Correctional Education, v.35, n.4, pp. 112-117.

Mohler, T. C. (1986). Innovations in education. Corrections Today, v.48, n. 2, pp. 84-85.

Morgan, D. (1979). Prevalence and types of handicapping conditions found in juvenile correctional institutions: a national survey. Journal of Special Education, v.13, pp.283-295.

National Governors' Association (1987). Labor Notes, n.14. Washington, DC.

Nelson, C. M. (1987). Handicapped offenders in the criminal justice system. In Nelson, C., Rutherford, R., and Wolford, B., eds. Special Education in the Criminal Justice System. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

——— et al. (1985). Handicapped offenders: Meeting education needs. Corrections Today, v.47, n.5, pp. 32-34.

——— et al. (1987). Special Education in the Criminal Justice System. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Nimick, E. H., et al. (1985). Juvenile Court Statistics, 1982. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.

Nixon, M., and C. S. Bumbarger (1984). Correctional centres: Articulating purposes. Journal of Correctional Education, v.35, n.2, pp. 63-69.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (1985). Children in Custody. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Parker, J. A. (1985). Illinois' women wardens. Corrections Today, v.47, n.5, pp. 124-132.

Pfannenstiel, J. C. (1979). Post-Release Experiences of Students from State Correctional Institutions, Volume 3. Santa Monica, CA: Systems Development Corporation.

——— and Keesling, J. W. (1980). Compensatory Education and Confined Youth: A Final Report, Volume 5. Santa Monica, CA: Systems Development Corporation.

——— et al. (1980). Compensatory Education and Confined Youth: The Substudy of Effective Practices, Volume 4. Santa Monica, CA: Systems Development Corporation.

Ramey, L. (1984). A life skills program for incarcerated offenders: Origin and development. Journal of Correctional Education, v.35, n.2, pp. 50-53.

Reagen, M., and Stoughton, D., eds. (1976). Findings, conclusions, and recommendations, in Reagen, M., and Stoughton, D. School Behind Bars: A Descriptive Overview of Correctional Education in the American Prison System. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press.

Reffett, S. (1983). The correctional school and the public mind. Journal of Correctional Education, v.34, n.2, pp.40-43.

Riddle, W. (1985). "Grants to State Agencies for the Education of Neglected or Delinquent Children Under Chapter 1, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act: Brief Legislative and Funding History and Analysis of Program Evaluations," in A Compilation of Papers on the Twentieth Anniversary of the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Serial No. 99-D, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee of Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives.

Roberts, A. R. (1979). Instructional technology behind bars. Educational Technology, v.19, n.1, pp. 26-29.

Rutherford, R. B., and C. M. Nelson (1986). The learning handicapped adult offender. In B. I. Wolford, compiler, Correctional Education: Perspectives on Programs for Adult Offenders. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

——— (1985). Special education in the most restrictive environment: Correctional/special education. Journal of Special Education, v.19, pp. 59-71.

Snarr, R. (1987). The criminal justice system. In Nelson, C., Rutherford, R., and Wolford, B. Special Education in the Criminal Justice System. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Storck, C. S. (1985). Standardizing vocational education. Corrections Today, v.47, n.5, pp. 44-45.

Tracy, P. E., et al. (1985). Delinquency in Two Birth Cohorts: An Executive Summary. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Travisono, D. N., ed. (1988). 1988 Directory: Juvenile and Adult Correctional Departments, Institutions, Agencies, and Paroling Authorities. College Park, MD: American Correctional Association.

Turner, J. (1987). Food service education. Corrections Today, v.49, n.3, pp. 110-114.

U.S. Department of Education (1986). Evaluation of the integration of technology for instructing handicapped children, RFP 86-028. Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Labor (1986). Evaluation and technical services for a Job Corps computer-assisted instruction pilot project, RFP OAA-86-12. Washington, DC.

U.S. General Accounting Office (1977). Reevaluation Needed of Educational Assistance for Institutionalized Neglected or Delinquent Children. Washington, DC.

Wagner, J. H. (1986). A house full of learning. Corrections Today, p. 97.

Waidley, J. W. (1986). Vocational education, industries, and career education in corrections. In B. I. Wolford, compiler, Correctional Education: Perspectives on Programs for Adult Offenders. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

Williams, J., et al. (1984). 3 M's = G.E.D. . . Motivation . . . Management . . . Momentum. Journal of Correctional Education, v.35, n.3, pp. 97-103.

Wilson, J. Q., and Herrnstein, R. J. (1985). Crime and Human Nature. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Wolford, B. I., et al. (1987). "Youth in Transition: A National Survey of State Juvenile Correctional Services." Richmond, KY: Training Resource Center, Eastern Kentucky University.